UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,021	01/17/2006	Elka Touitou	P-6249-US	6151
	7590 03/28/200 dek Latzer, LLP	EXAMINER		
1500 Broadway 12th Floor		VENCI, DAVID J		
New York, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/532,021	TOUITOU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David J. Venci	1641
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Octo 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the second condition.	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 71-93 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 71-93 are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 1641

Unity of Invention

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372:

I. Claims 71 and 73-76, drawn to cell-based assays with pharmacologic endpoint

II. Claims 72, 77-80 and 92, drawn to cell-based assays with concentration endpoint

III. Claims 81-91, drawn to devices and systems thereof

IV. Claim 93, drawn to cell-based assays for optimizing therapeutic efficacy

According to PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2, inventions must form a single general inventive concept by sharing a common technical feature that contributes over the prior art. However, Inventions I through IV do not form such a single general inventive concept because the technical feature common to Inventions I through IV does not contribute over the prior art.

Specifically, the device of Invention III is used in the methods of Inventions I, II and IV. However, Rotman (US 4,734,372) describes all the elements of the device of Invention III, including a donor compartment (see Fig. 2, cavity 48), a receiver compartment comprising cells (see Figs. 1 and 2, cell compartment 20), and a membrane (see Figs. 1 and 2, membranes 22 and 24) located between the donor and receiver compartments.

Therefore, unity of invention is lacking because Inventions I through IV do not form a single general inventive concept by sharing a common technical feature that contributes over the prior art. In

<sup>1</sup> Examiner requires restriction between product and process claims. Where Applicant elects to prosecute claims directed to a product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, Examiner will consider withdrawing the instant restriction requirement and rejoining non-elected, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claims (*i.e.*, all the process claims must include all the limitations of the allowable product claims). Examiner will not rejoin non-elected, withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with the allowable product claims. See MPEP

§ 821.04(b). Thus, where Applicant elects to prosecute claims directed to a product, Examiner advises Applicant to continually amend the non-elected, withdrawn process claims during prosecution to require all the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Upon rejoinder, Examiner will fully examine the rejoined process claims in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 for compliance with all criteria for patentability, including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102,

Application/Control Number: 10/532,021 Page 3

Art Unit: 1641

accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, Applicants are required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

This application contains claims directed to the following species:

1. Select ONE "hydrophobic layer" from:

a. collagen and glycosaminoglycan; (claims 81, 83, 84, 87 and 88) (claims 81, 83-86, 88 and 89) b. SILASTIC®, silicone; c. ceramides; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) d. cholesterol, cholesteryl esters, cholesterol derivatives; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) e. phospholipids; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) f. free fatty acids, esters of free fatty acids; g. cellulose acetate membrane, pure cellulose acetate; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) h. cellulose nitrate; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) polysulfone membrane; (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) i. glass fiber; OR (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89) k. TEFLON®. (claims 81, 83, 84 and 89)

2. Select ONE apparatus "form" from:

a. sack, teabag, pocket, container;
b. tube, container; OR
c. plate, dish, container.
(claims 81 and 90)
(claims 81 and 90)
(claims 81 and 90)

Applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372 to elect ONE species from each of species groups 1 and 2, *supra*. Examination on the merits shall be restricted to Applicants' elected species so long as generic claims 71, 72, 81, 92 or 93 are under rejection. Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

The members of species groups 1 and 2 appear to lack a common special technical feature required under PCT Rule 13.2. For example, the members of species group 1 lack unity of invention because each "hydrophobic layer" has a different composition with different permeability characteristics. The

Art Unit: 1641

members of species group 2 lack unity of invention because each apparatus "form" appears to have a

different conformation resulting in different rheological and filtration characteristics.

Applicants are advised that a complete reply to this requirement must include: (i) an election of an

invention and species to be examined, even if the requirement is traversed<sup>2</sup> (37 CFR 1.143), and (ii)

identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention and species. An argument that claims are

allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by a complete

election.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship

must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is

no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship

must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to David J. Venci whose telephone number is (571)272-2879. The examiner can normally be

reached on 08:00 - 16:30 (EST). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

apply where Examiner withdraws the restriction requirement before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant may elect an invention or species with traverse or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, Applicant must elect with traverse. Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct from each other, Applicant should clearly admit on the record, or submit or identify evidence already on the record that the inventions or species are obvious variants over each other. However, if Examiner finds one Invention or species unpatentable over prior art, Examiner may use the evidence or admission of record to reject other inventions or species under 35 U.S.C.103(a). If Applicant elects with traverse but does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in this restriction requirement, then Applicant's election is considered incomplete and treated as an election without traverse pursuant to MPEP § 818.03(a). Failure to timely argue in support of traversal will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,021 Page 5

Art Unit: 1641

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

David J Venci **Assistant Examiner** Art Unit 1641

/Long V Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1641